APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,734	07/06/2001	Eser Kandogan	ARC920010088US1	7012

			EXAMINER
30355	7590	02/02/2004	ROSWELL, MICHAEL

DANIEL E. JOHNSON
IBM CORPORATION, ALMADEN RESEARCH CENTER
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT. C4TA/J2B
650 HARRY ROAD
SAN JOSE, CA 95120-6099

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/900,734	Applicant(s) KANDOGAN, ESER
	Examiner Michael Roswell	Art Unit 2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 July 2001*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 October 2001* is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because various items lack a descriptive label. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 17-19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 17-19 are objected to for being in improper dependent form. The claims are written in the form of a preamble made to depend on another claim. The stated preamble is not given patentable weight as it fails to breathe life, meaning, and vitality into the claims. As such, the claims fail to further limit the subject matter of the claim(s) upon which they depend. See MPEP §§ 608.01(n) and 2111.02.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Keller et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,767,852) and Carlson et al (U.S.

Patent No. 5,623,592).

4.   In regards to claims 1 and 15, Keller et al describe a method for performing a

task in a processor-based system that includes a monitor and a user input device

(Column 1, Lines 6-10). The method displays on the monitor a plurality of connector

pieces representing respective tasks (Column 4, Lines 64-67 and Column 5, Line 1), the

connector pieces being called "process-control icons", arranged hierarchically (Column

5, Lines 10-12 and 18-20). Keller et al also teach the arrangement of applications by

class through the use of process-control icons (Column 5, Lines 9-12) similar to

connector pieces, and the organizing of these icons into "shelves" (Column 5, Lines 18-

20). The use of these shelves reflects the ability of Keller et al to arrange their process-

control icons hierarchically.

5.   It is well known in the art that items arranged hierarchically may be presented to

the user in various forms, including lists and trees, and in this case, shelves. Tree

structures serve to organize elements into easily identifiable classes and subclasses,

much like the shelf system described by Keller et al. The examiner takes OFFICIAL

NOTICE of these teachings. Therefore it would have been obvious to present the

hierarchically arranged items in a tree structure due to its similarity to Keller et al's shelf structure.

6.   The method of Keller et al further displays a plurality of attachment pieces on the monitor, each configured to interconnect with at least one connector piece (Columns 4-5, Lines 66-1), the connector pieces being called "icons" or "process icons". Keller et al further use a user input device to position an attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor, the positioning indicating a desire on the part of the user to complete the task (Column 4, Lines 46-63).

7.   Keller et al fail to describe the prompting of the user for information necessary to the task, and the inputting of necessary information, following the positioning of an attachment piece close to a connector piece.

8.   Carlson et al do teach the prompting for and inputting of such information necessary to the task, and the inputting of necessary information, following the positioning of an attachment piece close to a connector piece. (Column 21, Lines 60-64).

9.   Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Keller et al and Carlson et al to obtain a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor.

10.   One would be motivated to make such a combination due to the customization

options made available to the user through prompting for necessary information, for

example, the selection of specific operational parameters from a more general list of

operation modes (Carlson et al, Column 7, Lines 29-33).

11.   In regards to claim 2, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an

attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Keller et al

further disclose a method wherein the positioning of attachment and connector pieces in

close proximity results in the appearance of interconnected pieces (Columns 4-5, Lines

67-1, and item **450** of Fig. 4).

12.   In regards to claim 3, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an

attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Carlson et al

further teach the inclusion of confirming default settings from the processor during the

inputting stage (Column 8, Lines 1-7).

13.   In regards to claim 4, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an

attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Keller et al

disclose the graphical manipulation of attachment and connector pieces to match the

colors of each (Column 5-6, Lines 65-67, 1-6). For example, a process-control icon

"shelf" may designate high priority processes, and be colored red. Every task or

process added to the shelf would subsequently be colored red. Other levels of priority

can be given different colors in order to differentiate between priorities.

14.   In regards to claim 5, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an

attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Keller et al

describe the matching of attachment and connector piece contours while the pieces are

interconnected (Columns 4-5, Lines 64-67, 1 and item **450** of Fig. 4).

15.   In regards to claim 6, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Keller et al teach the matching of graphical attributes between attachment pieces and connector pieces (Columns 5-6, Lines 65-67, 1-6).

16.   Although Keller et al and Carlson et al teach a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor, they fail to disclose the matching of specific images on connector and attachment pieces.

17.   It is well known in the art that the graphical attributes of an icon can include color, texture, shape, or images upon such an icon. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of these teachings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to similarly match the images on attachment and connector pieces as the colors of the pieces have been matched. Keller et al give motivation for matching colors of the connector and attachment pieces (and thus other graphical attributes) in stating, "this graphical attribute may be a function of the priority value **242**. For example, an icon representing a task with high priority may be red. An icon representing a task with low priority may be green. Finally, the PCM changes **480** the priority of the process associated with icon **260** to that of the region **284**" (Column 6, Lines 1-6).

18.   In regards to claim 8, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an

attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Keller et al

further teach the interconnection of one attachment piece to possibly more than one

connector piece (Columns 4-5, Lines 64-67, 1).

19.   In regards to claim 9, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an

attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor, the connector

pieces being arranged in a tree structure. Keller et al support the movement of an

attachment piece from one part of the structure to another (Column 6, Lines 50-55).

20.   In regards to claim 10, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an

attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor.

21.   However, Keller et al and Carlson et al do not disclose the installation of a printer as one of the tasks run by the claimed invention.

22.   It is well known in the art that a "task" is analogous to a "process" (Keller et al, Column 1, Line 9). A task or process may include the running of a program, installation of software or hardware, or removal of software or hardware. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of these teachings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the installation of a printer as one of the tasks or processes run by the claimed invention. The motivation to run tasks or processes based upon such iconic relocation is given by Keller et al, who state, "this invention permits users to control the priority of processes represented by graphical objects, e.g., icons and windows, using priority-controller icons or regions of the computer screen" (Column 3, Lines 37-40).

23.   In regards to claims 11-13, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Carlson et al describe the selection of an attachment piece from a menu (Column 15, Lines 62-64) and from a toolbar, referred to as an "icon bar" (Column 21, Lines 34-35).

24.   Although Keller et al and Carlson et al describe a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and inputting of necessary

information from the user following the positioning of an attachment piece and a

connector piece in close proximity on the monitor and the selection of an attachment

piece from a menu and from a toolbar, they fail to disclose the arrangement of pieces in

a piled, overlapping fashion.

25.   It is well known in the art that icons can be arranged in various ways, including

linearly, in three-dimensional space, and in a piled, overlapping fashion. The

overlapping of icons on screen is advantageous due to the reduction in display size

such an arrangement offers. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of these

teachings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to arrange the pieces in a piled,

overlapping fashion for the amount of display space made available for other functions.

26.   In regards to claim 16, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an

attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Carlson et al

teach the creation of a piece in the tree (Column 7, Lines 5-10 and items **224, 226, 228,**

and **230** of Fig. 2). Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to teach the

addition of pieces into the hierarchy, therefore allowing for the created piece to become

a parent of any additional piece on the monitor.

27.   In regards to claim 17, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an

attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Keller et al

also teach the practice of including the method in a computer program on a computer

readable medium (Column 3, Lines 61-64).

28.   In regards to claim 18, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

first and second pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and inputting

of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an attachment piece

and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Keller et al also teach the

practice of including the method in a computer program on a computer readable

medium (Column 3, Lines 61-64).

29.   In regards to claim 19, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to

disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of

attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the prompting for and

inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of an

attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the monitor. Carlson et al

teach the creation of a piece in the tree (Column 7, Lines 5-10 and items **224, 226, 228,**

and **230** of Fig. 2). Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown *supra* to teach the

addition of pieces into the hierarchy, therefore allowing for the created piece to become

a parent of any additional piece on the monitor. Keller et al also teach the practice of

including the method in a computer program on a computer readable medium (Column

3, Lines 61-64).

30.   Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Keller et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,767,852), Carlson et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,623,592) and

Wajda (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,498).

31.   In regards to claims 7 and 14, Keller et al and Carlson et al have been shown

supra to disclose a method for performing a task that includes the display and

manipulation of attachment and connector pieces representing specific tasks, and the

prompting for and inputting of necessary information from the user following the

positioning of an attachment piece and a connector piece in close proximity on the

monitor.

32.   Keller et al and Carlson et al fail to teach the inclusion of interconnected pieces

on a connector piece, and the inclusion of a sub-tree on the first tree structure.

33.   Wajda does teach the use of an interconnected piece with a connector piece

(Column 3, Lines 21-23 and Fig. 3).

34.   Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of Keller et al, Carlson et al, and Wajda

to obtain a method for performing a task that includes the display and manipulation of first and second pieces representing specific tasks, the prompting for and inputting of necessary information from the user following the positioning of a first piece and a second piece in close proximity on the monitor, and a connector piece that allows for interconnection with other pieces in a tree and sub-tree structure.

35.   One would have been motivated to combine the connector and attachment piece system for the representation of specific tasks of Keller et al and Carlson et al with the ability to interconnect other task pieces to another connector piece, as is in Wajda, for the advantage of organizing compatible or dependent tasks together. See Wajda (Column 3, Lines 32-34).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Roswell whose telephone number is (703) 305-5914. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.

Michael Roswell
1/5/2004

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173